

## REMARKS

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-19 and 27-44 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 27 are the independent claims. Claims 1-19 and 27-44 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vemuri et al. (hereinafter Vemuri; Publication No. US 2004/0054643 A1) in view of Bohannon et al. (hereinafter Bohannon; Publication No. US 2002/0091718 A1).

#### *A. Applicants' Objection to the Present Rejection*

In the June 13, 2006 office action, the examiner rejected claims 1-19 and 27-44 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vemuri in view of Bohannon, as well as on 35 USC § 101 grounds. Applicants addressed both issues in their August 31, 2006 reply. In the following February 7, 2007 office action, the examiner repeated the 35 USC § 101 rejections but was silent with respect to the applicants' traversal of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections. Applicants then addressed the 35 USC § 101 rejections in a July 9, 2007 reply. Now, in the most recent office action, the examiner has re-raised these same 35 USC § 103(a) rejections.

Applicants respectfully object to the examiner's treatment of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections as failing to meet the requirements of MPEP § 707.07(f) "Answer All Materials Traversed" by failing in the February 7, 2007 office action to address the applicants' traversal of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections in the applicants' August 31, 2006 reply and by then repeating the rejections in the examiner's September 18, 2007 office action. Because of this, applicants are unsure as to examiner's disposition of their traversal, which negatively impacts the applicants' ability to appropriately respond to the present office action. Applicants respectfully request that examiner take appropriate remedial action, including removing the finality of the September 18, 2007 office action.

For the sake of clarity, applicants have substantively restated below their arguments in traversing the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections.

*B. Applicants' Claimed Invention*

Applicants' independent claim 1 is directed to "a method for providing a database view comprising transaction-consistent data reflecting the contents of a database at a specific point in time, said database comprising data elements and associated with a transaction log, said transaction log comprising active transactions and inactive transactions, said database view comprising difference storage for storing prior versions of at least one of said data elements from said database." Claim 1 recites that the method comprises, among other things, "maintaining a side page table that comprises information regarding whether each data element is stored in the difference storage and whether each data element is allocated in the difference storage."

*C. Claims 1-19 and 27-44 are Patentable over Vemuri in View of Bohannon*

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection over Vemuri in view of Bohannon should be withdrawn, since the combination of Vemuri and Bohannon fails to disclose "maintaining a side page table that comprises information regarding whether each data element is stored in the difference storage and whether each data element is allocated in the difference storage."

The examiner states that Bohannon discloses this portion of the claim in sections [0030], [0074] and [0080]: "A dirty page table (dpt) is maintained for the database (also in the system database) which records the pages that have been updated since the last checkpoint. The ATT (with undo logs) and the dirty page table are also stored with each checkpoint."

However, this "dirty page table" does not comprise information regarding whether each page is definitely in a difference storage and whether each page is potentially in a difference storage, as recited in claim 1. Because Vemuri in view of Bohannon fails to disclose every element of claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1. Because claim 1 is in condition for allowance, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-19 are in condition for allowance.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1746/301620.01  
**Application No.:** 10/611,774  
**Office Action Dated:** September 18, 2007

**PATENT**  
**REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED**  
**PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO**  
**37 CFR § 1.116**

Claim 27 was rejected “for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.” Because claim 1 is in condition for allowance, applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is in condition for allowance for at least the reason recited with respect to claim 1.

Claims 28-44 depend from claim 27. Because claim 27 is in condition for allowance, applicants respectfully submit that claims 27-44 are in condition for allowance.

Date: January 10, 2008

/Michael J. Swope/  
Michael J. Swope  
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439